PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET for Combating Wildlife Crime Toolkit (version 1.3)	
Reference Information*	**Definition/Guidance**
Name of Indicator	**11.1.a Detection rate of evidence of wildlife crime**
Name of Result Measured	This indicator is linked to Key Result 11.1 (*Increased rate of detection*), which is one of several in Group Box 11 (*Increased risks for wildlife criminals*) shared by most strategic approaches in the Combating Wildlife Crime Toolkit. This indicator may be relevant for activities applying strategic approaches 2-8 and 10 in the toolkit, which all include Group Box 11.
Is this a USAID PPR Indicator? Y/N	*If Yes, note which years the indicator will be reported in the Performance Plan and Report (PPR) and identify to which program element it links in the Foreign Assistance Standardized Program Structure and Definitions (SPSD).*
Precise Definition	This indicator measures the rate at which signs of wildlife crime are detected by enforcement personnel or other parties (e.g., community patrols, airport baggage handlers). "Signs of wildlife crime" are defined as observations of suspected poachers, poaching equipment, illegal wildlife products in markets, illegal wildlife products in transit, or illegal wildlife products found on a person. Detection rate of evidence of wildlife crime is measured in two ways: ● Number of signs of wildlife crimes detected for each person-hour of surveillance, which is calculated as: (# of observations of suspected poachers, poaching equipment, illegal wildlife products in markets, illegal wildlife products in transit, and/or illegal wildlife products found on a person) / (total person-hours* spent in surveillance for evidence of wildlife crime) *The project should determine the appropriate number of people engaged in active surveillance as opposed to note taking, etc. in calculating total person hours. ● Number of signs of wildlife crime per unit area or distance under surveillance, which is calculated as: (# of observations of suspected poachers, poaching equipment, illegal wildlife products in markets, illegal wildlife products in transit, and/or illegal wildlife products found on a person) / (total area or distance under surveillance for evidence of wildlife crime)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET for Combating Wildlife Crime Toolkit (version 1.3)	
Reference Information*	**Definition/Guidance**
	Calculation of both measures is recommended to enable project implementers to account for changes in time spent in surveillance as well as changes in the area or distance under surveillance when interpreting changes in the number of detections of evidence of wildlife crime. Detection rate is expected to increase with instances of wildlife crime, and increase with enforcement skill. Therefore, an increasing detection rate may indicate increased enforcement skill and/or increased crime. Thus, projects should use their individual context and assumptions to determine the desired direction for detection rate. If possible and appropriate to the project scope, this indicator should be measured in conjunction with other factors that are associated with increased risks for wildlife criminals, including: increased probability of arrest (Key Result 11.2), increased probability of prosecution (Key Result 11.3), increased probability of conviction (Key Result 11.4), and increased probability of appropriate penalty/deterrent applied to conviction (Key Result 11.5).
Unit of Measure	Number of signs of wildlife crimes detected for each person-hour of surveillance Number of signs of wildlife crime per unit area or distance under surveillance
Data Type	Rate
Disaggregated by	Type of wildlife crime; Age of evidence (active, recent, old) (e.g., for indications of poacher presence); In cases where a suspect is identified when the crime is detected, disaggregating by characteristics of the suspect as appropriate to the project (e.g., nationality, community affiliation, sex, age, etc.) may be useful; Other disaggregates as useful

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET (PIRS) for Combating Wildlife Crime Toolkit, v. 1.3	
Reference Information*	**Definition/Guidance**
Rationale for Indicator (optional for USAID)	This indicator measures the rate at which signs of wildlife crime are found. This indicator may also be relevant when the associated result appears in a customized chain. For all potential Group Box 11 ("increased risk") Key Result indicators, project/monitoring design teams should advocate for a "do no harm" principle by being cognizant of creating perverse incentives through their choice of indicator. It is likely that the data available to track these indicators is biased toward lower-level perpetrators; these are the easiest to catch and possibly convict (as opposed to middlemen and higher-level criminals and kingpins), and authorities and other partners can easily "count" these wins toward the achievement of their indicator. Thus, project teams should consider designing indicators that incentivize the capture of the largest-impact criminals. Overly criminalizing lower-level poachers can have an overall negative effect, particularly on communities, and can limit opportunity to cultivate allies in wildlife crime enforcement. Possible solutions to create proper incentives may be to disaggregate data by the criminal's "level" (e.g., low-level, middleman, high-level/kingpin) or by the number and severity of charges brought, and/or to focus data collection only on those crimes typically undertaken by middlemen or higher-level criminals.
Data Source	Determining who (e.g., agencies and/or offices, as well as functional positions) collects what kinds of data, as well as who has authority and access to the data, is of paramount importance for all indicators associated with Key Results in Group Box 11. For more information, see "Method of Data Collection and Construction."
Method of Data Collection and Construction	Implementers should determine how crime data is collected and categorized (by specific offenses or in broad categories) locally, and then determine the most feasible method for tracking individual cases in subsequent steps of the enforcement-prosecution chain. Being allowed access to, and collecting, the data recommended for these indicators can be difficult, so it is recommended that project teams work through the recommended decision tree structure below to determine how – and if – to proceed with tracking steps in Group Box 11:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET (PIRS) for Combating Wildlife Crime Toolkit, v. 1.3	
Reference Information*	**Definition/Guidance**

	Is data consistently collected?
	• If **yes**, do our implementing partners have access to data?
	  • If **yes**, include quantitative crime data in M&E
	  • If **no**, is it feasible and "worth it" to support access to the data (most likely by supporting or partnering with those who do have access to the data)?
	  • If **yes**, include quantitative crime data in M&E
	  • If **no**, look for alternative data (e.g., existing or new perception survey questions, such as asking audiences, "how likely do you think it is that a wildlife criminal will go to jail or pay a large fine? (not likely/somewhat likely/very likely/certain)," or asking rangers, "do you know other rangers who have let perpetrators go?" or use other randomized response techniques).
	• If **no**, is it feasible and "worth it" to support the collection of data as part of the project?
	  • If **yes**, include quantitative crime data in M&E
	  • If **no**, look for alternative data (e.g., existing or new perception survey questions, such as asking audiences, "how likely do you think it is that a wildlife criminal will go to jail or pay a large fine? (not likely/somewhat likely/very likely/certain)," or asking rangers, "do you know other rangers who have let perpetrators go?" or use other randomized response techniques).
	
	For this indicator, tools such as Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tool (SMART) and others are designed to collect this type of data and should be utilized.
	
	Data is collected through review of records held by relevant authorities within given jurisdictions, typically park and wildlife authorities. How data is collected, including how person-hours spent in surveillance and distance or area under surveillance are determined, must be consistent and should be determined by the implementer.
	
	The design of data collection instruments and protocols for data collection and analysis should be informed by robust statistical methodologies and

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET (PIRS) for Combating Wildlife Crime Toolkit, v. 1.3	
Reference Information*	**Definition/Guidance**
	best practices in the field. Available guidance and models should be consulted when available. For all USAID-funded projects: Implementers should respect data ownership rights as well as data sensitivity issues. All data collected should be archived and made available through the Development Data Library (DDL) per ADS Chapter 579, USAID Development Data. Note that this includes "datasets from which indicator values are derived" (ADS Chapter 579) and survey data.
Reporting Frequency	The frequency at which these data are measured will depend on the type of evidence, available survey techniques, and available records. Data should be reported at least annually.
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID	*Identify staff member(s) directly responsible for the data, preferably the specific position title or role rather than the employee's name.*
Baseline Timeframe	An initial baseline measure must be established.
Rationale for Targets (optional for USAID)	*Explain the general basis on which targets are set for the indicator.*
Dates of Data Quality Assessments (DQA) and name of reviewer	*Dates of each DQA must be indicated as well as the name of the corresponding USAID staff member responsible for the review.*
Date of Future DQAs (optional for USAID)	*Date of future planned DQAs should be indicated*.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET (PIRS) for Combating Wildlife Crime Toolkit, v. 1.3	
Reference Information*	**Definition/Guidance**
Known Data Limitations	**Known Data Limitations for Key Results 11.1-11.5** (as defined by USAID DQA Guidance): As many identified data limitations are common to indicators for all key results in the enforcement-prosecution chain, all data limitations to Key Results 11.1-11.5 are considered collectively in this field. **Validity:** ● The number of illegal products detected in local markets or transit points may underestimate levels of illegal trade, as black market trade may not be detectable. The representativeness of samples can be difficult to judge. ● Enforcement agencies may be unwilling or unable to grant access to official enforcement records because those records are seen as sensitive, potentially embarrassing, or possibly damaging to the agencies. ● Tracking individual cases from detection through conviction and penalty can be difficult due to differing procedures and record-keeping across agencies. **Reliability:** ● Official records may be poorly maintained; there can be little consistency in the content or quality of the records that are kept. Electronic case files are rare, and paper case files may not be managed or organized in a systematic way. ● Tracking individual cases from detection through conviction and penalty can be difficult due to differing procedures and record-keeping across agencies. **Timeliness:** ● Tracking time served may fall outside the project timeframe. ● Official records may not be consistently kept or regularly updated. **Precision:** It may be problematic to attribute the achievement of any of the five steps of the enforcement-prosecution chain to project efforts, as various other factors may come into play. **Integrity:** Reporting of detected crimes by patrols or others tasked with doing so can be vulnerable to corruption.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET (PIRS) for Combating Wildlife Crime Toolkit, v. 1.3	
Reference Information*	**Definition/Guidance**
References	1. USAID. 2017. *Measuring Efforts to Combat Wildlife Crime: A Toolkit for Improving Action and Accountability. Version 1.3*. USAID Forestry and Biodiversity Office. Available at: https://rmportal.net/biodiversityconservation-gateway/legality-sustainability/wildlife-crime/measuring-efforts-to-combat-wildlife-crime

* All fields are required if this indicator is reported in USAID Performance Plan and Report (PPR), unless the field is marked “optional for USAID.” Non-USAID users should select only PIRS elements that are appropriate to their needs.